



Meeting notes: Colorado Team
January 24, 2012

Note-taker: Ashley Frame
Facilitator: Scott Marion

The team took a few minutes to read through the 6 “agreements.”

Lively discussion took place around the first agreement: whether one performance level would be assigned to a teacher. There were concerns about morale of teachers and the overall morale of the professions. There were equal concerns about the performance level labeling a *teacher* instead of a *behavior*. The idea was tossed around to come up with performance descriptors of each of the domains, but having no summative evaluation. In other words, one evaluative word would be used for each of the domains to paint a fuller picture of a teacher. Some felt that using multiple measures to come up with one evaluative word was fair and multiple “summative” evaluations might make the already complicated process more complicated. There was some discussion about student data, since the goal that everyone could agree on was student growth and achievement. Some wanted student data to indicate proficiency before other evaluative measures were considered—or that the proficiency of students should be a minimum. There was some general concern for the autonomy of schools to address their own goals and priorities, and that performance descriptors might limit those district and school goals.

The other agreements and the matrix document were not examined/discussed.